

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action of January 21, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Applicant has added claims 37-56 by the present amendment. Claims 1-56 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-3 and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Office Action indicates that claim 1 calls for a plurality of independent event streams, where each stream has a plurality of events, but that claim 1 then “limit[s] event to a single event for each of the plurality of independent event streams.” However this is not found in the claim. Claim 1 reads as follows:

1. (Original) A computer-implemented method of generating random numbers using a plurality of random number generators, the method comprising:
 - (1) generating a plurality of independent streams of events;
 - (2) selecting *an event* from the independent streams based on an arrival time of the event in relation to arrival times of other events in the plurality of independent streams of events; and
 - (3) using the selected event to generate a random number.

Claim 1 clearly recites selecting *an event* from the independent streams. Claim 1 does not limit an event stream to a single event. Rather, the selected event is chosen based on an arrival time of the event in relation to arrival times of other events in the plurality of independent streams of events. Claim 1 contains no contradictory assertion that an independent stream contains a plurality of events on the one hand, but that the event is limited to a single event for each of the plurality of independent streams. Claim 1 is thus allowable as originally written.

Claim 21, containing similar language as in claim 1, is allowable for similar reasons as claim 1.

Allowed Claims

The Office Action indicates that claims 4-20 and 24-36 are allowed, and that claims 1-3 and 21-23 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicant respectfully submits, as discussed above, that claims 1-3 and 21-23 are also allowable as written.

New Claims

Applicant has added new claims 37-56. Claims 37-39 are similar to claims 1-3, but with slight differences in scope. Claims 40-42 are similar to claims 21-23, but with slight differences in scope. Claims 43-56 have been added to more broadly claim the invention. No new matter has been added.


CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3153.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 13 day of Apr., 2004

By: 
Ross Dannenberg, Registration No. 49,024

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001

RAD/mmd